UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,388	07/19/2005	Yuji Takeda	004476.00036	4453
22907 BANNER & W	7590 03/04/200 ITCOFF, LTD.	EXAMINER		
1100 13th STR		PATEL, VIP		
SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2889	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/517,388	TAKEDA ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Vip Patel	2889			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEMENTED IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Designs of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.5 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Poperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutively reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing appearance of the provided patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 [December 2008				
·	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 December 2008</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
٥/ا	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application.					
,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected.					
· ·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
-	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
-	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		Examiner.			
,	Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notice (3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

If this application currently names joint inventors, in considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakaya et al (US 5998921).

Regarding claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, Nakaya discloses a lamp (see fig 5) comprising a tubular glass lamp vessel (2), a conductor layer (6) on an outer surface of the vessel. The conductor layer has a component of Tin (see line 44 of column 5). The limitations of how the conductor layer is formed (ie by solder dipping, blasted, ultrasonic solder dipping), is directed to the process of making, which is not deemed positive product limitation. Courts have been holding for quite some time that "--in spite of the fact that a product-by-process claim may recite only process limitations, it is the product which is covered by the claims and not the recited process steps--". (In re Hughes, 182 USPQ 106). Also, "--patentability of a claim to a product does not rest merely on a difference in the method by which the product is made. Rather, it the product itself which must be new and unobvious--". (In re Pilkington, 162 USPQ 147). Accordingly, "--a rejection based alternatively on either section 102 or section 103 of the statue is eminently fair

and acceptable--". (In re Brown and Saffer, 173, USPQ 685 and 688). As such, no patentable weight has been given to such process limitations (see MPEP 2113).

Regarding claims 2 and 6, limitations of additives (such as AI) to conductor layer is known in the art for improving reliability of contact. Thus, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add AI to contact layer as is well known for the purpose of improving reliability of contact. Alternatively, this limitation is not deemed patentable since the applicant's disclosure fails to show such limitation to solve any problems or to yield any unobvious advantage that is not within the scope of the teachings applied. Therefore, such limitation would be a matter of design alternative.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's filed arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for following reasons. Applicant argues that recited process step results in physically differ product than the prior art product. However, no such physically different product limitations are recited in the claim.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Application/Control Number: 10/517,388 Page 4

Art Unit: 2889

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vip Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-2458. The examiner can normally be reached on 5.30am- 2pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Toan Ton can be reached on (571) 272-2303. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/517,388

Art Unit: 2889

/Vip Patel/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 2889 Page 5